## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIAJURA COUDLEY, CLERK BIG STONE GAP DIVISION APR 1 6 2015 BY: DEPUTY CLERK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	Case No. 2:12CR00026-001
v.	)	OPINION
WILLIAM BRYAN YOUNG,	)	By: James P. Jones United States District Judge
Defendant.	)	Officed States District Judge

Nancy C. Dickenson, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Abingdon, Virginia, for Defendant.

The defendant, a federal inmate sentenced by this court, has filed a motion for a sentence reduction pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2), based upon the two-level reduction in the drug guideline ranges adopted by Amendment 782 to the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual ("USSG") and made retroactive to the defendant's case by USSG § 1B1.10(d).

The court may reduce the term of imprisonment of a defendant made eligible under § 1B1.10, "after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a) to the extent they are applicable." 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). "Whether to reduce a sentence and to what extent is a matter within the district court's discretion." United States v. Smalls, 720 F.3d 193, 195 (4th Cir. 2013). In addition to the §

3553(a) factors, the court may consider public safety concerns as well as the

defendant's post-sentencing conduct. USSG § 1B1.10 cmt. 1(B) (ii), (iii).

When originally sentenced, the defendant was determined to have an

advisory imprisonment range of 87 months to 108 months, based upon an Offense

Level of 29, with a Criminal History Category of I. The defendant was sentenced

to 108 months of incarceration, at the high end of that range. Because of

Amendment 782, the new guideline range applicable to the defendant is 70 months

to 87 months, based upon a new Offense Level of 27.

As required, I have considered all of the relevant factors, including those

emphasized in the defendant's motion. While I find that it is appropriate to reduce

the defendant's sentence, I believe that a sentence of 87 months is appropriate in

light of the nature of the defendant's criminal conduct in this case. The reduced

sentence is comparable to the defendant's original sentence, and is a sufficient but

not greater than necessary sentence, even in light of the defendant's post-

sentencing conduct and rehabilitation efforts.

A separate Order will be entered herewith.

ENTER: 4/15/15

-2-